

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

26

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
CHRISTOPHER P. KOSH
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
600 CONGRESS AVENUE
SUITE 1600
AUSTIN, TX 78701

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 28150.12		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 05 JUN 2002
International application No. PCT/US01/16665		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International filing date (day/month/year) 22 May 2001 (22.05.2001)	Priority date (day/month/year) 26 May 2000 (26.05.2000)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06F 17/30; G06T 11/00 and US Cl.: 707/501.1, 513, 523		
Applicant NEWSSTAND, INC		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 26 September 2002 (26.09.2002).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231
Facsimile No. (703)305-3230

Authorized officer
Heather HERNDON
Telephone No. 305-3700

Peggy Harwood

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/16665

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed

☒ the description:

pages 1-29, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the claims:

pages 30-50, as originally filed

pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the drawings:

pages 1-27, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

☐ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages NONE, as originally filed

pages NONE, filed with the demand

pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages NONE _____

☐ the claims, Nos. NONE _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINIONInternational application No.
PCT/US01/16665**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	YES
	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	YES
	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	YES
	Claims <u>Please See Continuation Sheet</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Please See Continuation Sheet

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.

V.1. Reasoned Statements:

The opinion as to Novelty was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 1-36, 38, 40, 47, 50, 52, 59, 62, 64, 71, 78, 85, 92, 94-111, 116-118, 124-126, 132-134

The opinion as to Novelty was negative (No) with respect to claims 37, 39, 41-46, 48-49, 51, 53-58, 60-61, 63, 65-70, 72-77, 79-84, 86-91, 93, 112-115, 119-123, 127-131, 135

The opinion as to Inventive Step was positive (Yes) with respect to claims NONE

The opinion as to Inventive Step was negative (NO) with respect to claims 1-135

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was positive (YES) with respect to claims 1-135

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was negative (NO) with respect to claims NONE

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 37, 39, 41-46, 48-49, 51, 53-58, 60-61, 63, 65-70, 72-77, 79-84, 86-91, 93, 112-115, 119-123, and 127-131, and 135 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584 A2, published 14 May 1999.

Per independent claims 37, 49 and 61; FRIEDMAN discloses: storing a first version of a mass-produced printed paper ("newspaper page"-page 6, lines 4-12), the first version having a first format ("native file format document"-page 33, line 6; "scanning paper document"-page 20, lines 25-30); and translating the first version into a second version (e.g., raster format which is displayable by Web browser 238"-page 33, lines 20-26; "XML environment"-page 29, lines 7-30); , the second version having a second format (*inherent* in, e.g., HTML rendering page 35, lines 4-12, also page 21, lines 8-17)), the second version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper (substantially exact reproduction of the page as it originally appeared in newsprint"-page 6, lines 4-12).

Per dependent claims 39, 51 and 63: FRIEDMAN discloses encrypting the second version (*inherent* in "security and access control data is provided, which determines who is allowed to access the information"-page 38, lines 19-20).

Per dependent claims 41, 53 and 65; FRIEDMAN further discloses: extracting characters from the first version (automatic text recognition process such as OCR"-page 21, lines 1-5); and adding a term from the characters to an index in the second version ("indices for information retrieval are created"-page 21, lines 5-6).

Per dependent claims 42, 54, and 66; FRIEDMAN discloses rasterizing the first version to create a rasterized image ("converted into digital raster format"-page 20, lines 25-30); including the rasterized image in the second version implied ("raster format displayable by Web browser 238"-page 33, lines 20-25); and including a pointer in the index to indicate a location of the term in the rasterized image ("coordinates... geographically locate the word within the document"-page 21, lines 10-15).

Per dependent claims 43, 55, and 67; FRIEDMAN further discloses: storing a reference in the second version website (e.g., "hypertext links"-page 14, lines 15-20).

Per dependent claims 44, 56, and 68 FRIEDMAN further discloses associating the reference with a media file, and including the media file in the second version ("video segments, sounds, and so forth"-page 25, lines 5-12).

Per dependent claims 45, 57 and 69 FRIEDMAN further discloses: wherein the translating comprises: associating the reference with a script; and including the script in the second version ("ACTIVE X objects"-page 26, lines 10-21; Section 3- Java Bean"-page 12, line 32 et seq.).

Per dependent claims 46, 58 and 70; FRIEDMAN further discloses: associating the reference with a website address; and including the website address in the second version (e.g., "hypertext links"-page 14, lines 15-20; "Web browser"-page 27, lines 20-25).

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Per dependent claims 48, 60, and 72 FRIEDMAN further discloses "link table 218"-page 30, line 16.

Per independent claims 73, 80 and 87; FRIEDMAN discloses : storing a version of a mass-produced printed paper ("newspaper page"-page 6, lines 5-10) ; and identifying a portion of the version that is selectable (*inherent* in "printing the information on paper or by displaying the information on a web page"-page 27, lines 15-20; "printed on paper... according to the POST script protocol"-page 32, lines 15-20); and further selecting the document was *inherent* in "Web browser"-page 32, lines 23-25) , the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper ("displayed as a substantially exact reproduction of the page as it appeared in newsprint"-page 6, lines 5-10).

Per dependent claims 74, 81, and 88; FRIEDMAN further discloses wherein the portion is selectable to permit the portion to be printed in "printing the information on paper or by displaying the information on a web page"-page 27, lines 15-20; "printed on paper... according to the POST script protocol"-page 32, lines 15-20; and further selecting the document was *inherent* in "Web browser"-page 32, lines 23-25 because of its printing function).

Per dependent claims 75-76; 82-83, and 89-90; FRIEDMAN further discloses: the version that is selectable, wherein the portion is selectable to permit the portion to be copied ("clipboard"... to enable one software application such as native file format processor 236 to make information available to another application... is then pasted to HTML rendering engine..."-page 34, lines 1-10).

Per dependent claims 77, 84, and 91; FRIEDMAN further wherein the portion is selectable to permit the portion to be stored in a file (image format file-page 34, line 18).

Per dependent claims 79, 86 and 93; FRIEDMAN further discloses: wherein the portion is displayable on the display device as a likeness of an article that is included in the paper ("substantially exact reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 5-10).

Per independent claim 112, 120, and 128; FRIEDMAN demonstrates: storing a version of a mass-produced printed paper ("newspaper page"-page 6, lines 4-12); and on a display device, displaying the version as a likeness of the paper ("maintain the original appearance as much as possible"-page 6, lines 4-12) including an indicator of a hyperlink ("hypertext links"-page 14, lines 15-20; "links of XML are compatible with those of HTML"-page 9, lines 28-32; "link two sections of the chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10).

Per dependent claims 113, 121, and 129; FRIEDMAN discloses , displaying a first selector associated with a first portion of the paper on the display device; on the display device, displaying a second selector associated with a second portion of the paper on the display device; and on the display device, displaying a likeness of the first portion in response to a selection of the first selector (link table 218-page 30, line 16; "page 1 page component... information related to each paragraph"-page 16, lines 10-20; "Web browser"-page 42, lines 19-26, also via example element 238, FIG. 11).

Per dependent claims 114-15, 122-123, and 130-131; receiving a watch list term; searching the version for the watch list term; and displaying a result of the searching ("New search-FIG. 11).

Per dependent claims 119, 127, and 135 FRIEDMAN further discloses selecting a type of the indicator ("Web browser"-page 42, lines 19-26; "XML allows any type of element to act as a link"-page 9, lines 30-31).

Claims 38, 40, 50, 52, 62, 64, 78, 85 , and 92 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584 A2, published 14 May 1999.

Per dependent claims 38, 50, and 62 compressing the second version is not addressed by FRIEDMAN, although it was implied. It was notoriously well-known to compress files. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, i.e., PHOSITA at the time of the invention to compress the HTML/ XML files of FRIEDMAN to reduce storage space.

Per dependent claims 40, 52 and 64: FRIEDMAN provides for rasterizing the first version to create a rasterized image ("digital raster format"-page 20, lines 25-30. It fails to explicitly discuss decimating it raster image, although this was implied ("raster format displayable by Web browser 238 (page 33, lines 20-25). Further, it was well-known to decimate rasterized images in order to reduce resolution of the images. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to decimate the rasterized image of FRIEDMAN in the conversion to HTML (page 33, lines 20-25) in order to reduce resolution and thus bandwidth required for the transmission of FRIEDMAN to its web browser.;

Per dependent claim 78, 85 and 92; (dependent on claims 73, 80, and 87, respectively, above)FRIEDMAN lacks an explicit recitation identifying the portion of the version that is selectable, wherein the portion is displayable on the display device as a likeness of an advertisement within the paper, although it is implied ("as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 4-12). However, it was known to have full page advertisements. It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to select a full page advertisement for printing because it was suggested by FRIEDMAN ("reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 5-10)

Claims 1-16, 19-23, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 59 and 71 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584, published 14 May 1999, in view of MALCOLM, GB 2329998 A, published 07 April 1999.

Per independent claims 1, 6, and 11; FRIEDMAN discloses: : storing a version of a mass-produced printed paper ("... so as to maintain the original appearance as much as possible... so that a newspaper page is displayed as a substantially exact reproduction of the page as it originally appears in newsprint, for example"-page 6, lines 5-10); identifying at least a subset of characters within the version (implicit in "link might link two sections in a chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10; and "more powerful inking structure available... compatible with those of HTML. However, in addition, XML allows any type of element to act as a link"-page 9, lines 28-31); and in response to the identified subset, forming at least one hyperlink within the version (links of XML are compatible with those of HTML "-idem.), the version being displayable on a display

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

device as a likeness of the paper including an indicator of the hyperlink ("substantially exact reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 4-11; "displaying the information on a web page"-page 27, lines 18-20)"all information which is necessary to geographically locate the word within the document"-page 21, lines 10-15).

FRIEDMAN fails to adequately describe the process of "identifying keywords", all this process is strongly implied by the reference ("link editor 224, page 30, lines 25-30, and "links of XML are compatible with those of HTML"-page 9, lines 28-34).

MALCOLM, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates extracting text from markup language documents and creating hyperlinks associating those documents ("text string associated with the structure is extracted from the document... the extracted string is replaced with a hyperlink"-column 8, lines 24-32; and "parsing an existing document using keywords... and generates a hyperlink to another part of the hyperlinked document... and generating hyperlinks manually"-page 2, lines 12-27. It would have been obvious a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, *i.e.*, PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to create hyperlinks as disclosed in MALCOLM in the text of FRIEDMAN by assigning links of FRIEDMAN (page 9, lines 28-35) to related sections or documents in order to facilitate the navigation of the documents of FRIEDMAN, and in order to provide links to related information as explicitly suggested by FRIEDMAN ("might link two sections of a chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10 of FRIEDMAN).

Per dependent claims 2, 7, and 12; FRIEDMAN further provides for forming the hyperlink within a first portion of the version, wherein a second portion of the version is displayable on the display device in response to a selection of the indicator ("link two sections of a chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10; and "links of XML... compatible with HTML"-page 9, lines 28-34).

Per dependent claims 3, 8, and 13; FRIEDMAN further discloses: wherein the forming comprises: forming the hyperlink within a first portion of the version, wherein the first portion of the version is displayable on the display device as a likeness of a first portion of the paper, and wherein a second portion of the version is displayable on the display device as a likeness of a second portion of the paper ("link two sections of a chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10; and "substantially exact reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 4-12).

Per dependent claims 4, 9, and 14; FRIEDMAN further provides for: forming the hyperlink within a portion of the version, wherein a document is displayable on the display device in response to a selection of the indicator ("link two sections of a chapter"-page 30, lines 5-10; and "links of XML... compatible with HTML"-page 9, lines 28-34).

Per dependent claims 5, 10, and 15; FRIEDMAN further discloses: forming the hyperlink within a portion of the version, wherein a website is displayable on the display device in response to a selection of the indicator ("links of XML are compatible to those of HTML"-page 9, lines 28-34; "HTML rendering engine 212"-page 32, lines 20-23; "displayed on a web browser"-page 35, lines 5-10)

Per independent claims 16, 23 and 30; FRIEDMAN discloses: storing a version of a mass-produced printed paper ("newspaper page is displayed as a substantially exact reproduction of the page"-page 6, lines 4-12); and forming a reference within the version ("linking structure"-page 9, lines 28-34), the reference being associated with an operation and at least a portion of the version ("link two sections of the chapter... link is to another XML element which is not part of the XML document being rendered... the different XML document could also be served if necessary"-page 30, lines 5-10; "GUI Widgets"-page 13, lines 13-15; "user can define a button which appears on the viewed document, and then links the document to a different document"-page 14, lines 15-20), the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper ("reproduction of the page as it originally appeared in newsprint"-page 6, lines 4-12), and the portion being selectable to cause performance of the operation ("hypertext links"-page 14, lines 15-20).

Per dependent claim 19, 26 and 33; FRIEDMAN further discloses: forming the reference within the version, wherein the reference specifies a hyperlink to a website ("hypertext links"-page 14, lines 15-20), and wherein the operation includes displaying the website ("such that the different XML document could also be served if necessary"-page 30, lines 5-10).

Per dependent claims 20, 27 and 34; FRIEDMAN further discloses wherein the reference specifies a file, and wherein the operation includes displaying a visual image in response to the file (*inherent* "links of XML are compatible to those of HTML"-page 9, lines 25-30; "hyperlink information which describes all connections to locations on the World Wide Web"-page 38, lines 15-20;).

Per dependent claims 21, 28, and 35; FRIEDMAN further discloses: wherein the reference specifies a file, and wherein the operation includes outputting audio signals in response to the file ("documents, video segments, sounds and so forth"-page 25, lines 10-12).

Per dependent claims 22, 29, and 36; FRIEDMAN further discloses: forming the reference within the version, wherein the reference specifies a script, and wherein the operation includes executing the script ("ACTIVEX objects"-page 26, lines 10-21; Section 3- Java Bean"-page 12, line 32 et seq.).

Per dependent claims 47, 59 and 71 FRIEDMAN discloses all elements as applied in independent claims 37, 49, and 61, above. FRIEDMAN lacks an explicit recitation of detecting a term in the second version; creating a hyperlink in response to the detecting of the term; and including the hyperlink in the second version, although this is suggested ("link editor 224"-page 30, lines 25-30; and "coordinates of the words and the text within the document"-page 21, lines 8-12; and "indexing rules"-page 20, lines 5-7)). MALCOLM, on the other hand demonstrates that it was known to detect words in a document and create links among documents ("parsing an existing document using keywords... and generates a hyperlink..."-page 2, lines 13-27). It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to create

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

hyperlinks among documents of FRIEDMAN by identifying keywords as taught by MALCOLM in order to associate the web page of FRIEDMAN with additional information, and to facilitate browsing of related information (See MALCOLM, page 1, lines 20-21)

Claims 17-18, 24-25 and 31-32 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584, published 14 May 1999, in view of MALCOLM, GB 2329998 A, published 07 April 1999, and further in view of GUPTA ET AL, WO 00/30002, published 25 May 2000.

Per dependent claims 17-18, 24-25 and 31-32; FRIEDMAN further *implicitly* discloses an advertisement within the paper ("reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 4-12), however it lacks a recitation of hyper-linking these advertisements. GUPTA ET AL, on the other hand, explicitly discloses associating advertisements with web pages (page 26 line 25 et seq.) and hyperlink to an advertiser's web server (page 27, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, *i.e.*, PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to hyperlink the advertisements in FRIEDMAN in order to provide further information about a product or service, and in order to generate revenue for a content provider.

Claims 94-97, 100-103, and 106-104 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584, published 14 May 1999, in view of GUPTA ET AL, WO 00/30002, published 25 May 2000.

Per independent claims 94, 100, and 106; FRIEDMAN explicitly discloses storing a first version of a mass-produced printed paper ("original source format"-page 6, lines 5-10; "converted into a digital raster format"-page 20, lines 25-30), the first version having a first digital format ("digital raster format"-page 20, lines 25-30); replacing first content in the first version with second content; and translating the first version into a second version (e.g., XML Publisher 210-page 27, lines 15-25), the second version having a second digital format (XML, HTML, *idem.*), the second version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper ("substantial reproduction of the page as it originally appeared"-page 6, lines 5-10).

FRIEDMAN lacks an explicit recitation of the claimed replacing step, although it is suggested ("link editor 224"-page 30, lines 25-30). GUPTA ET AL, on the other hand, explicitly demonstrates a method of inserting local advertising into web pages (page 20, lines 20-25, pages 21-22). It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, *i.e.*, PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to employ the advertising system of GUPTA ET AL for at least some of the advertisements *inherent* in the newspaper of FRIEDMAN, by replacing these advertisements in order to provide advertisements better targeted to an online community.

Per dependent claims 95-96, 101-012, and 107-08; GUPTA ET AL discloses local advertising. National advertising is *inherent* in the newspaper of FRIEDMAN ("page as it originally appeared in newsprint"-page 6, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to PHOSITA to replace a national advertisement in FRIEDMAN with a local advertisement as demonstrated by GUPTA ET AL, in order to better target a specific online community.

Per dependent claims 97, 103, and 109; GUPTA ET AL explicitly discloses targeting advertising in a Web browser based on a user profile (client's age and credit rating... demographic information to provide tailored content ..."-page 25, lines 14-28). It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to employ the profiling system of GUPTA ET AL in the online newspaper of FRIEDMAN in order to tailor advertisements to a particular customer and thus increase its effectiveness.

Claims 98-99, 104-105, and 110-111 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584, published 14 May 1999, in view of GUPTA ET AL, WO 00/30002, published 25 May 2000, as applied above, and further in view of PERLIN ET AL, US 5,341,466 A, published 23 August 1994.

Per dependent claims 98, 104, and 110 compressing the second version is not addressed by FRIEDMAN, although it was implied. It was notoriously well-known to compress files. It would have been obvious to a Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art, *i.e.*, PHOSITA, at the time of the invention to compress the HTML/ XML files of FRIEDMAN to reduce storage space.

Per dependent claims 99, 105 and 111: FRIEDMAN discloses encrypting the second version (*inherent* in "security and access control data is provided, which determines who is allowed to access the information"-page 38, lines 19-20).

Claims 116-118, 124-126, and 132-134 lack inventive step under PCT article 33(3) as being obvious over FRIEDMAN, WO 99/23584 A2, published 14 May 1999, as applied above, and further in view of PERLIN ET AL, US 5,341,466 A, published 23 August 1994.

Per dependent claims 116-118, 124-127, and 132-134; PERLIN ET AL discloses a zoom/ pan function (FIG. 5). It would have been obvious to PHOSITA at the time of the invention to include a pan function in FRIEDMAN in order to size its image to a users likeness and was suggested by Adobe Acrobat (page 18, lines 17-25 of FRIEDMAN).

Per claims 1-72, CARD, "The WebBook and Web Forager...", discusses hyperlinking pages in a navigation of a document having many pages. This is cumulative to the art applied (e.g., MALCOLM).

Per claims 94-108 WO 00/20945 (YEE) describes translation of digital content from one version to another and is cumulative to the FRIEDMAN reference, as applied above, in this regard.

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Per claims 73-93, WO 99/60458 (PATTERSON) discloses adding hyperlinking information to a digital image (FIG 10) and is largely cumulative to the FRIEDMAN reference, as applied above, in this regard.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

GB 2,329,988 A (MALCOLM) 07 April 1999, see abstract, pages 1-3, page 7, lines 19-32.